

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,982	11/16/2001	Chikashi Satou	110811 8001	
25944	7590 11/12/2004		EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			NGUYEN, XUAN LAN T	
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3683	
			DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/987,982	SATOU ET AL.	G)
navioury nation	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lan Nguyen	3683	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 27 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti IE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offict timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a).	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) Ithey raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	·	,	
 (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or 	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancell	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consideration	dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,5-12 and 14-36</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

10. Other: initialed and signed copy of IDS dated 10/27/04

Lan Nguyen O Patent Examiner Art Unit: 3683 Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant argues that by combining the claims, as presented in the amendment dated 10/27/04, they would be allowable. No allowable subject matter was indicated previously. As combined, the claims would still be rejected. Applicant further argues that the amendment would not raise new issues that would require further consideration and search. By combining the claims, Applicant has changed the scopes of the claims. This would require further considerations.